Scott. II-29—85,056—2-11-26.

Development (1926) Department.

Mis: SERIES.

G.O. No. 1655

DATED 23-11-1926.

[Despatch Abstract.]

D 2938 B
5.11.26

To

The Chief Secretary,

Government of Madras,

Development Department.



Thro

The District Forest Officer,

Mangalore North, South Kanara.

Humble memorial for consideration submitted by V. Govindan, late 2nd grade Forest Guard, Nagodi Beat, P.O. Coondapur, South Kanara.

CW 1898/726-4

25
28-10-26

The Government may be pleased to note that the Final Proceedings of the Chief Conservator of Forests, already submitted as an enclosure is dated 14th July 1925 and Government may also be pleased to note that this communication which was posted to the memorialist to Coondapur must necessarily have taken more than ten days' time.

Even granting therefore that this order which was the final one had reached memorialist on the 20th July '25, your memorialist had submitted his appeal on the 18th January, 1926 which is within six months as contemplated under Rule XIII(ii)of the "C" memorial Rules.

Most respectfully submitted
V. Govindan
28-10-26

That as a matter of fact the said proceedings dated 14th July 1925 was received by the memorialist on 27-11-25 for reasons explained in the memorial, but apart from this as submitted above memorialist must be considered to have submitted his memorial within time.

The memorialist therefore humbly and respectfully prays his memorial may be restored and gone into and necessary orders passed.

For which act of Justice, benevolence and mercy, memorialist shall ever feel grateful.

V. Govindan
Memorialist.

Dated 6th Octr. '26.

A vi CW 1898/726-4.

DESP... 1926

Returned to the petitioner, such memorials petitions cannot be forwarded from this Office to Govt who have already passed final orders in the matter.

L.Dis No. 2114/26. Office of the Chief Conservator of Forests.
Chepauk Madras, dated 30th April 1926

H. Tireman Esquire, C.I.E.
Chief Conservator of Forests.

Subject :- Memprial - Forest Guard - V. Govinda - North Mangalore Division - orders passed.

Read :- G.O.No. Mis 619, Development, dated 22nd April 1926

Read the following papers :-

From the Chief Conservator of Forests. Ref No. 2114/26. dated 7th April 1926.

Order

The Chief Conservator is requested to inform the Memorialist that the Government are unable to interfere on his behalf. His memorial is summarily rejected under Rule XIII (11) of the " C " Memorial Rules.

" When a petition is an appeal against an order of decision of the Board of Revenue or other authority subordinate to the Local Government and is made more than six months after the communication of such order of decision to the petitioner and no satisfactory explanation of the delay is forthcoming. "

By order of the Governor in Council/

Proceedings

Communicated to the District Forest Officer North -- Mangalore and Conservator Sixth Circle.

2. The District Forest Officer is requested to Communicate the orders of the Government to the Memorialist.

Sd/ xxxxxxxx
For Chief Conservator.

L.Dis C.No. 920/F.26.

Copy to Memorialist V. Govinda.

6.5.26

Mangalore, dated 5th May 1926. Dt. Forest Officer.
North Mangalore.

M.M.R/ 6-5-26. 6.5.26

By regd post Acknt Due

DESPATCHED
8th MAY 1926

Revn. Department

Subject — Memorial — Forest Guard V. Govindan — North Mangalore — Revision of orders — p1 cf —

[C.No. 2938 I — From the V. Govindan, late forest guard — North Mangalore Division.]

Hs

The memorialist V. Govindan, late forest guard, North Mangalore Division requests that his previous memorial summarily rejected in G.O. 619 Dev dy 22.4.26 may be reconsidered and revised orders passed after going into the case. He contends that his previous memorial was not time barred.

p1 cf

2. The D.F.O. North Mangalore returned the present memorial of V. Govindan on p.1 c/f when it was submitted to Govt. though the D.F.O. North remark that such unnecessary petitions cannot be forwarded to Govt. He has now sent the same petition direct to Govt. His case was examined in G.O. 619 Dev dy 22.4.26 on its merits as well and summarily rejected. There is no need therefore to reconsider orders issued in the G.O. 916 Dev dy 22.4.26. His present memorial may be rejected under rule XIII (2) of the Memorial Rules. In view of the D.F.O's endorsement on the memorial

vide D.F.O's Lr. at the foot of p1 cf.

(Y)

(Y)

p3 of G.O. 920 Fin 23.12.24

and the fact that the memorialist submits the same grant, no ~~question~~ orders seem necessary. A draft order is submitted ~~herein~~ to be passed on the petition. It may perhaps be simply lodged and the draft order put up below is unnecessary but it repeats only the former order.

(Y)

C.R. 10.11.26

Kell 12.11.26

Petitioner's second appeal to C.C. was rejected & the order was received by petitioner on 10/1/25. He applied to the C.C. again. The C.C's final order was on 14/7/25. The petitioner ~~appeal~~ to Government was dated 18.1.26 & as this was more than 6 months after 10/1/25, the date of C.C.'s first order, the petition was rejected by Government.

Petitioner says he received the C C's final order on 27/12/25. C.R. more than 5 months after it was issued. The cover containing the order appears to have been "Refused". The petitioner says he was away from home & so knew nothing about it. The explanation is probably not bona fide. If we give the petitioner the benefit & assume that he was waiting bona fide to try to get

the C.C. to revise his order before he approached Government & assume further that his explanation that he was away from home might be accepted the order already passed must require revision. I doubt if it really does. In any case, the merits of the case have been considered when passing the S.O. If the Secretary considers any revision necessary, Petitioner may be told that Govt see no reason to interfere

15/11/26

S.

unnecessary

Re Petn may be told that Govt are not prepared to interfere on his behalf.

WSR
16.11.26

WS

A revised draft order is submitted.

16/11/26.

CR
16.11.26

16.11.26

Scott.—XI-5 (a)—28,703—6-12-24. (6)

Dev DEPARTMENT.

	Date.	Initials.
When received for Fair-copying.		
When copied		
When examined		
When signed		
When despatched		

Memorial

Forest Guard - V. Govindan - North Mangalore - reconsideration - Orders passed

READ AGAIN G.O. No. 619 Dev, dated 22. 4. 1926.

" " " " " " 192

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 2938 I From V. Govindan, late forest guard, N. Mangalore Dn., No. —, dated 28. X. 1926.

" " " " " " 192.

" " " " " " 192.

ORDER.

No. 1655, dated 23. 11. 1926.

Mu.

The petitioner is informed that the Government are not prepared to interfere on his behalf.

CR 19/11/26

16.11.26

To

The Petitioner (g/o)

Copy to the C.C.F. (a to)

Dev 24. NOV 1926

Scott. II-5 (a)—28,703—6-12-24. (6)

Dev. DEPARTMENT.

	Date.	Initials.
When received for Fair-copying.		
When copied		
When examined		
When signed		
When despatched		

Memorial

Forest Guard - V. Govindan - North Mangalore - reconsideration - Orders passed.

READ AGAIN G.O. No. 619 Dev., dated 22. 4. 1926.

" " " " " " 192 .

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 2938 I From Sri V. Govindan, late forest guard - North Mangalore, No. —, dated 28. 10. 1926.

" " " " " " 192 .

" " " " " " 192 .

ORDER.

No. , dated 192 .

M 10.

His memorial is summarily rejected under rule XIII (2) of the 'C' Memorial Rules.

[H.E. Rule XIII (2)]

CR
10.11.26

To

The Memorialist (920)
(with p. 2 cf)

Copy to the C.C.E.
(a/f pl cf. & c)